

REMARKS

I. General:

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a) as failing to show a folding shelf as cited in claim 10. Applicant has amended claim 10 to remove this feature from the claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection has been obviated.

Claims 10-12 and 18-20 were objected to as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. According to the Examiner, in claims 10 and 18 a “folding shelf” is claimed and surfaces 106, 107 slide but do not fold. While, Applicants have obviated this objection by way of the aforementioned amendments, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s contention that the surfaces 106, 107 slide and do not fold. Applicants respectfully point out that the specification teaches that the “panels 106, 107” extend. Accordingly, any manner of extending the panels is within the scope of the present invention, whether by folding, sliding, or other arrangements.

Claims 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,195,835 to Eyre et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Eyre”). In order to diversify the scope of claims, Applicants have elected to cancel claims 14-17; accordingly, the rejections of claims 14-17 have been obviated. With respect to claims 9 and 13, Applicants submits that claims 9 and 13 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 9 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,964,427 to Murphy (hereinafter referred to as “Murphy”) in view of Eyre. In order to diversify the scope of claims, Applicants have elected to cancel claim 15 accordingly, the rejection of claim 15 has been obviated. With respect to claim 9, Applicants submits that claim 9 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 10-12 and 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Eyre and U.S. Patent No. 2,301,630 to Krienitz (hereinafter referred to as “Krienitz”). In order to diversify the scope of claims, Applicants have elected to cancel claims 18-20; accordingly, the rejections of claims 18-

20 have been obviated. With respect to claims 10-12, Applicants submits that claims 10-12 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth below.

II. Neither Eyre, Murphy, nor Krienitz teach or suggest all the elements of claims 9-13 and 21-35.

Claim 9 recites “opening a cover on a case and extending at least one panel from the case to provide a launch platform on which an uninflated balloon can be placed”. Neither Eyre, Murphy, nor Krienitz teach or suggest the foregoing step. Eyre teaches neither a cover, case, nor a panel as recited in claim 9. Neither Murphy nor Krienitz teach or suggest extending at least one panel from the case. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is allowable over the cited references. Furthermore, since claims 10-13 and 21-26 depend from claim 9, Applicants respectfully submit that they to are allowable over the cited references for at least this reason.

Claim 11 recites “supporting the case by extending a plurality of legs from the case, wherein said legs may be extended from the case prior to opening the cover”. Claim 29 recites “the launch platform is provided, at least in part, by opening a case that is supported by extending a plurality of legs from the case, wherein said legs may be extended from the case prior to opening a cover of the case.” According to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to use the legs on Murphy’s system as taught by Krienitz to elevate the launching platform from the ground. However, the legs of Krienitz cannot be extended from the case prior to opening the cover of the case. Accordingly, the cited references neither teach nor suggest all the elements of claims 11 and 29. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully requests allowance of claims 11 and 29.

Claims 12 recites “said launch bag includes an elastic material” and claim 27 recites “a launch bag that includes an elastic material”. According to the Examiner, Eyre teaches an “enclosure that is made from a material that is capable of being expanded”. However, Applicants respectfully point out that Eyre neither teaches nor suggests a launch bag that includes an elastic material. Accordingly, for at least this reason, claims 12 and 27 are allowable. Furthermore, since claims 28-35 depend from claim 27, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that they to are allowable.

Claim 21 recites “supporting the case by extending a plurality of legs from the case, wherein said legs fold out from the back of the case and the back of the case is located on a side of the case that is opposite the cover”. Claim 31 recites “the launch site

includes a launch platform that is provided, at least in part, by opening a case that is supported by extending a plurality of legs from the case, wherein said legs fold out from the back of the case and the back of the case is located on a side of the case that is opposite the cover”. According to the Examiner, Krienitz teaches legs; however the legs of Krienitz do not fold out from the back of the case as recited in claims 21 and 31. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21 and 31 are allowable.

Claim 22 recites “wherein the case includes at least one wheel that permits transportation of the case”. Claim 32 recites “the launch site includes a launch platform that is provided, at least in part, by opening a case that includes at least one wheel that permits transportation of the case”. The cited references neither teach nor suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 22 and 32 are allowable.

Claim 23 recites “wherein the case includes a handle and at least one fitting that enables the case to be secured to a solid structure”. Claim 33 recites ‘the launch site includes a launch platform that is provided, at least in part, by opening a case that includes a handle and at least one fitting that enables the case to be secured to a solid structure’. The cited references neither teach nor suggest “at least one fitting” as recited in claims 23 and 33. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 23 and 33 are allowable.

Claim 24 recites “wherein the case includes a handle and at least one fitting that enables the case to be lifted”. Claim 34 recites “the launch site includes a launch platform that is provided, at least in part, by opening a case that includes a handle and at least one fitting that enables the case to be lifted”. The cited references neither teach nor suggest “at least one fitting” as recited in claims 24 and 34. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24 and 34 are allowable.

Claim 25 recites “extending another panel from the case to provide the launch platform on which the uninflated balloon can be placed”. Claim 35 recites “the launch site includes a launch platform that is provided, at least in part, by extending a first and a second panel from an open case. The cited references neither teach nor suggest “extending another panel” as recited in claim 25 or extending “a first and second panel”

as recited in claim 35. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 25 and 35 are allowable.

Claim 26 depends from claim 25 and recites “wherein at least one of the panels extends beyond the end of the balloon”. The cited references neither teach nor suggest “a panel that extends beyond an end of the balloon” as recited in claim 26. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 26 is allowable.

III. Conclusion:

Applicants submit that the subject matter of the present application is novel, nonobvious, and useful. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections and objections be withdrawn and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Dated: September 8, 2007

/Michael Pruden/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Michael Pruden, Reg. No. 52,135

Ollila Law Group, L.L.C.

Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 22

Facsimile: (303) 938-9995